PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D 08 APR 2005

WIPO" PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

| X-15985 | or agen | 's file reference | FOR FURTHER AC | Preliminary | ation of Transmittal of International Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416) |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| PCT/US 03/31513 24.10.2003 | | | International filing date | day/month/year) | Priority date (day/month/year) |
| | | | | | 05.11.2002 |
| nternationa CO7C217 | | t Classification (IPC) or t | ooth national classification a | and IPC | · |
| Applicant ELI LILL | Y AND | COMPANY et al. | | | |
| 1. This Auth | internation | ational preliminary exa nd is transmitted to th | amination report has been applicant according to | n prepared by this Article 36. | International Preliminary Examining |
| 2. This | REPC | PRT consists of a total | of 7 sheets, including t | his cover sheet. | |
| | haan | amended and are the | anied by ANNEXES, i.e. e basis for this report and on 607 of the Administra | d <i>i</i> or sheets containi | ription, claims and/or drawings which have ng rectifications made before this Authority der the PCT). |
| The | ese ann | exes consist of a tota | l of sheets. | | |
| | | | | | |
| 3. This | s repor | t contains indications | relating to the following | tems: | |
| 1 | \boxtimes | Basis of the opinion | | | |
| | _ | • | | | |
| 11 | | Priority | | | |
| 11 111 | × | Non-establishment | | novelty, inventive s | tep and industrial applicability |
| III IV | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve | ntion | *1 | |
| 111 | × | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve | ntion | vith regard to novel | tep and industrial applicability ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| III IV | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ations supporting such s | vith regard to novel | |
| III IV V | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vations supporting such s cited ne international application | vith regard to novel tatement | |
| III IV V VI | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vertions supporting such s cited | vith regard to novel tatement | |
| III IV V VI VII | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vations supporting such s cited ne international application | vith regard to novel tatement | ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| III IV V VI VII | | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the Certain observation | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vations supporting such s cited ne international application | with regard to novel statement on plication | ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| III IV V VI VII | M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the Certain observation | ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vations supporting such s cited ne international application | with regard to novel statement on plication | ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| VI VII VIII Date of st | M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand | ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) to ations supporting such socited The international applications on the international ap | vith regard to novel statement on plication | ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| VII VII VIII VIII VIII VIII VIII VIII | ubmission of the control of the cont | Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse Reasoned statement citations and explant Certain documents of Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand | ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) to the international applications on the international applications on the international applicational | vith regard to novel statement on plication Date of completio 07.04.2005 | ty, Inventive step or industrial applicability; |

REC'D 0 8 APR 2005

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US 03/31513

| I. | Basis | of the | report |
|----|--------------|--------|--------|
| | Dasis | OI HIG | ICDUIL |

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

| | Desc | cription, Pages | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------|--|
| | 1-147 | | as originally filed | | |
| | Clair | ms, Numbers | | | |
| | | - | | | |
| 1-44 as originally filed | | | | | |
| 2. | With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. | | | | |
| | The | se elements were ava | allable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is: | | |
| | | the language of a tra | nslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(| b)). | |
| | | the language of publi | cation of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)). | | |
| | | the language of a tra Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3 | nslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (und 3). | ler | |
| 3. | With inter | regard to any nucle national preliminary e | otide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing: | e | |
| | | contained in the inter | mational application in written form. | • | |
| | | filed together with the | e international application in computer readable form. | | |
| ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form. | | | ntly to this Authority in written form. | | |
| ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form. | | | ntly to this Authority in computer readable form. | | |
| | | The statement that to in the international a | he subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the discl pplication as filed has been furnished. | osure | |
| | | The statement that the listing has been furn | he information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written seq ished. | uence | |
| 4. | The | amendments have r | esulted in the cancellation of: | | |
| | | the description, | pages: | | |
| | | the claims, | Nos.: | | |
| | | the drawings, | sheets: | - | |
| 5. | . 🗆 | This report has been been considered to | n established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they ha go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)). | ve ··· | |
| | | (Any replacement si report.) | heet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed | d to this | |
| 6 | . Add | ditional observations, | if necessary: | | |

| IJ, | Non | establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | sions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non- or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of: | | | |
| | | the antire international application, | | | |
| | · . | -s Nos. 1-16 and 19-44 in part | | | |
| | | ୍ୟର୍ଷ୍ଟ: | | | |
| | . \$ | term said international application, or the said claims Nos. 40-44 (for industrial applicability) relate to the newwing subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify): | | | |
| | | see separate sheet | | | |
| | | the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify): | | | |
| | | the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. \Box | | | |
| | \boxtimes | no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos. 1-16 and 19-44 in part | | | |
| 2. | or a | eaningful international preliminary examination cannot be carried out due to the failure of the nucleotide and/ mino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative ructions: | | | |
| ٠. | П | the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard. | | | |
| | | the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard. | | | |
| IV | . Lac | k of unity of invention | | | |
| 1. | In r | esponse to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees, the applicant has: | | | |
| | | restricted the claims. | | | |
| | | paid additional fees. | | | |
| | | paid additional fees under protest. | | | |
| | | neither restricted nor paid additional fees. | | | |
| 2. | × | This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees. | | | |
| 3. | Thi: is | s Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 | | | |
| | | complied with. | | | |
| | | not complied with for the following reasons: | | | |
| 4. | | nsequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary | | | |

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US 03/31513

| | × | all parts. | | | |
|----|------|---|-------------|------------------|--|
| | | the parts relating to claims Nos | 3 | | |
| ٧. | | asoned statement under Artic ations and explanations suppo | | | rd to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; |
| 1. | Sta | tement | | | |
| | Nov | velty (N) | | Claims Claims | 1-44 |
| | Inve | entive step (IS) | Yes: No: | Claims Claims | 2 1,3-44 |
| | Ind | ustrial applicability (IA) | Yes: No: | Claims Claims | 1-39 |

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

÷,

EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

- 1. Claims 40-44 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).
- 2. Claims or parts of claims relating to compounds for which X is not unsubstituted or substituted phenyl have not been subject to search. Parts of the claims for which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of an international preliminary examination (Rule 66.1(e) PCT). No opinion with regard to novelty and inventive step therefore has been established for subject-matter of claims 1-16 (in part) and 19-44 (in part).

Re Item IV

Lack of unity of invention

In order to satisfy the requirement of unity compounds cover by a Markush-formula must have a significant structural element in common. Furthermore, this common part of the structure must distinguish the compounds from any known compounds having the same property/activity.

The structural element common to all compounds of present claim 1 is the skeleton CH-CH2-NR1R2.

This structural element is however known for compounds of the prior art having the same activity (see for example XP 000605241, EP 0373836).

Present claim 1 therefore lacks unity (Rule 13.1 PCT).

The following groups of inventions therefore are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept:

1. compounds wherein Z=F (claims 1-13 (in part), 14,17-44 (in part)

- 2. compounds wherein Z=OH (claims 1-13 (in part), 15, 17-44 (in part)
- 3. compounds wherein Z=OAlk (claims 1-13 (in part), 16, 17-44 (in part)

Furthermore, since compounds for which Z=OH or OALK are also known from XP000605241, groups 2 and 3 are subdivided into inventions in which each invention is defined by one of the definitions of Y as claimed in claim 1.

Re Item V

16

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

D1: MELLONI P ET AL: "POTENTIAL ANTIDEPRESSANT AGENTS-ALPHA-ARYLOXY-BENZYL DERIVATIVES OF ETHANOLAMINE AND MORPHOLINE" EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY, EDITIONS SCIENTIFIQUE ELSEVIER, PARIS, FR, vol. 19, no. 3, 1984, pages 235-242, XP000605241 ISSN: 0223-5234

D2: EP-A-0 373 836 (LILLY CO ELI) 20 June 1990 (1990-06-20)

1. Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT):

- 1.1 D1 discloses norepinephrine uptake inhibitors of formula (I). The compounds of D1 differ from the compounds of present claim 1 in that A=O.
- 1.2 D2 (EP 0 373 836) discloses serotonin and norepinephrine uptake inhibitors of formula (I). The compounds of D2 differ from the compounds of present claim 1 in that Z=H in D2.

174

- 1.3 The subject-matter of claims 1-44 then can be considered novel.
- 2. Inventive Activity (Article 33(3) PCT):

2.1 Starting from D1 as the closest prior art, the technical problem can be seen in providing improved compounds which are serotonin and norepinephrine uptake inhibitors.

The solution suggested by the applicant then would be the replacement of an oxygen atom with a sulfur atom. This substitution is, in absence of a technical effect linked to this exchange considered obvious to the person skilled in the art, since ethers and thioethers can be expected to have the same or similar properties.

Even if one would considered this exchange non-obvious, the person skilled in the art would derive from D2 that exchanging O for S results in compound which have the same activity.

The subject-matter of claims 1, 3-44 therefore cannot be considered inventive.

2.2 Regarding the subject-matter of claim 2, when A=O Y cannot be optionally substituted phenyl or optionally substituted 1,3-benzodioxolyl when Z is OR₃ (proviso of claim 1).

The difference between D1 and claim 2 then is for example that Y is a different aromatic substituent.

D1 or D2 do not suggest compounds for which Y is an aromatic substituent different from phenyl.

In view of D1 and D2 the subject-matter of claim 2 therefore can be considered inventive.

- 3. Industrial Applicability (Article 33(4) PCT):
- 3.1 The subject-matter of claims 1-39 is industrially applicable.